



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,429	03/25/2004	Shyh-Kwei Chen	YOR920040052US1	6945
48150 7590 01/08/2010 MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817				
EXAMINER				
JOHNSON, JOHNESE T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2166				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/08/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/808,429

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Johnese Johnson

Art Unit

2166

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to the amendment filed on 8-31-2009, claims 1 and 3-41 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1 and 3-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chandra et al. (US PG. Pub. No. 2002/0138582).

As to claim 1, Chandra discloses:

receiving an object and a collaboration code (see paragraphs 404 and 825);

determining a business object definition for said object based upon said collaboration code (see paragraph 653); and

storing said business object definition, wherein said collaboration code determines said business object definition for said object without pre-defined business object definitions, if the object does not conform to a known business object definition (see paragraphs 200).

As to claim 3, Chandra discloses:

wherein said object comprises a business object (see paragraph 617)

As to claim 4, Chandra discloses:

further comprising forwarding said object and said object definition (see paragraph 307).

As to claim 5, Chandra discloses:

wherein said forwarding comprises forwarding said object and said object definition to an application adapter (see paragraph 608).

As to claim 6, Chandra discloses:

further comprising processing said object based upon said object definition in said application adapter (see paragraph 642).

As to claim 7, Chandra discloses:

wherein said collaboration code determines how data from a second object is mapped to said object (see paragraph 341)

As to claim 8, Chandra discloses:

wherein said collaboration code determines how said object is derived from said second object (see paragraph 617).

As to claim 9, Chandra discloses:

wherein said collaboration code determines how said object is derived from said second object and a second object definition (see paragraph 617).

As to claim 10, Chandra discloses:

further comprising receiving said second object definition (see paragraph 608).

As to claim 11, Chandra discloses:

wherein said determining comprises determining said object definition for said object based upon said collaboration code and said second object definition (see paragraph 653).

As to claim 12, Chandra discloses:

wherein said receiving comprises receiving said object and said collaboration code from a broker (see paragraph 312).

As to claim 13, Chandra discloses:

a processor for receiving an object and a collaboration code
and for determining an object definition for said object based upon said collaboration code,
wherein said collaboration code determines said business object definition for said

object without pre-defined business object definitions, if the object does not conform to a known business object definition. (see rejection for claim 1)

As to claim 14, Chandra discloses:

wherein said object comprises a business object (see paragraph 617)

As to claim 15, Chandra discloses:

further comprising means for forwarding said object and said object definition to an application adapter (see paragraph 608).

As to claim 16, Chandra discloses:

wherein said collaboration code determines how data from a second object is mapped to said object (see paragraph 341)

As to claim 17, Chandra discloses:

further comprising means for receiving a second object definition, wherein said collaboration code determines how said object is derived from said second object and said second object definition (see paragraph 617).

As to claim 18, Chandra discloses:

wherein said means for determining comprises means for determining said object definition for said object based upon said collaboration code and said second object

definition. (see paragraph 617).

As to claim 19, Chandra discloses:

wherein said means for receiving comprises means for receiving said object and said collaboration code from a broker (see paragraph 312).

As to claim 20, Chandra discloses:

a processor serving to execute a reverse object discovery agent that receives a first object and a collaboration code from a broker and that determines a first object definition based upon said collaboration code, (see rejection for claim 1)
wherein said collaboration code determines said business object definition for said first object without pre-defined business object definitions, if the object does not conform to a known business object definition. (see rejection for claim 1)

As to claim 21, Chandra discloses:

a broker that receives a second object and a second object definition and that generates said first object using said collaboration code (see paragraph 312).

As to claim 22, Chandra discloses:

wherein said collaboration code determines how said first object is derived from said second object (see paragraph 617).

As to claim 23, Chandra discloses:

wherein said collaboration code determines how said first object is derived from second object and said second object definition(see paragraph 617).

As to claim 24, Chandra discloses:

an application adapter that receives said first object and said first object definition from said reverse object discovery agent. (see paragraph 608).

As to claim 25, Chandra discloses:

determining whether an object conforms to a known business object definition;
requesting a collaboration code and an input object definition if said object does not conform to a known object definition (see paragraphs 200);
receiving said collaboration code and said input object definition; and storing said collaboration code and said input object definition, wherein said collaboration code determines said business object definition for said object without pre-defined business object definitions, if said object does not conform to the known object definition (see paragraphs , 612, 653, and 200)

As to claim 26, Chandra discloses:

further comprising analyzing said collaboration code and said input object definition (see paragraph 200).

As to claim 27, Chandra discloses:

further comprising creating a new object definition based upon the results of said analyzing (see paragraph 653).

As to claim 28, Chandra discloses:

further comprising forwarding said object if said object conforms to a known object definition (see paragraph 200).

As to claim 29, Chandra discloses:

wherein said object comprises a business object (see paragraph 617).

As to claim 30, Chandra discloses:

further comprising forwarding said new object definition to an application adapter (see paragraph 608).

As to claim 31, Chandra discloses:

further comprising receiving a subscription from said application adapter for said new object definition (see paragraph 546).

As to claim 32, Chandra discloses:

further comprising forwarding said object in response to said subscription (see paragraph 546).

As to claim 33, Chandra discloses:

integrating computer-readable code into a computing system, the computer-readable code comprising (see paragraph 200)

instructions for receiving an object and a collaboration code (see claim 1);

instructions for determining a business object definition for said object based upon said collaboration code (see claim 1); and

instructions for storing said business object definition (see claim 1),

wherein said collaboration code determines said business object definition for said object without pre-defined business object definitions, if the object does not conform to a known business object definition (see claim 1).

As to claim 35, Chandra discloses:

wherein said object comprises a business object (see paragraph 617)

As to claim 36, Chandra discloses:

further comprising instructions for forwarding said new object definition to an application adapter (see paragraph 608).

As to claim 37, Chandra discloses:

further comprising instructions for receiving a subscription from said application adapter for said new object definition (see paragraph 546).

As to claim 38, Chandra discloses:

further comprising instructions for forwarding said object in response to said subscription (see paragraph 546).

As to claim 39, Chandra discloses:

wherein said collaboration code comprise dynamically generated business object newly discovered during runtime(see paragraphs 295 and 299).

As to claim 40, Chandra discloses:

wherein the means for receiving the object and the object and the collaboration code, the means for determining whether the object conforms to the known business object definition, and the means for determining the object definition for said object based on said collaboration code comprise a reverse object discovery agent means (see paragraph 200).

As to claim 41, Chandra discloses:

wherein said receiving the object and the collaboration code is performed before said determining the business object definition (see paragraphs 404, 825 and 653 – wherein the intersection of the transportable application access control definition and the

recipient access control definition indicates whether a particular recipient can access an application which means the transportable application access control definition is received first before the access for an individual is determined), and wherein said storing the business object definition is performed before said determining the business object definition (see paragraph 200 – wherein One or more application servers 202 host containers in the form of Enterprise Java Beans 204 and store programmatic objects representing containers, building blocks, pages, and transportable applications in a cache 206. Application servers 202 execute code of the containers and building blocks and call servers and services in a services domain 201 to result in servicing client requests which means objects are stored in the form of EJB's).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8-31-2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument that "Chandra fails to suggest, "receiving an object and a collaboration code" is acknowledged but is not deemed persuasive.

According to the examiner's interpretation, the limitation means that an object along with some executable code is received. Based on this, Chandra discloses this in paragraphs 404 and 825 where he discloses receipt of an object and executing code.

Applicant's argument that "Chandra fails to teach or suggest determining a business object definition for said object based upon said collaboration code" is acknowledged but is not deemed persuasive.

According to the examiner's interpretation, the limitation means that the business object's definition is determined based on the executable code. Based on this, the limitation is disclosed in paragraph 653 where Chandra discloses the intersection of the transportable application access control definition and the recipient access control definition indicates whether a particular recipient can access an application.

Applicant's argument that "Chandra fails to teach or suggest storing the business object definition" is acknowledged but is not deemed persuasive.

According to the examiner's interpretation, the limitation means that the business object definition is stored. Based on this interpretation, Chandra discloses this at paragraph 200 wherein one or more application servers 202 host containers in the form of Enterprise Java Beans 204 and store programmatic objects representing containers, building blocks, pages, and transportable applications in a cache 206. Application servers 202 execute code of the containers and building blocks and call servers and services in a services domain 201 to result in servicing client requests which means objects are stored in the form of EJB's.

Applicant's argument that "Chandra fails to teach or suggest wherein said collaboration code determines said business object definition for said object without pre-

defined business object definitions, if the object does not conform to a known business object definition " is acknowledged but is not deemed persuasive.

According to the examiner's interpretation, the limitations mean that executable code determines the object definition without pre-defined object definitions "if" it has no other definitions in which to compare. Based on this interpretation, Chandra discloses this in paragraph 200. Because Chandra does have previous definitions, they are used. Your wording of the limitations implies that the limitations are conditional and if the condition is not met then another method is taken. In this case, the other method is taken. The examiner suggests adding the other condition to the claim(s).

Applicant's argument that "Chandra fails to teach or suggest wherein said determining the business object definition for said business object comprises reverse engineering said business object to examine how the business object was obtained" is acknowledged but is not deemed persuasive.

Based on the examiner's interpretation, the limitation means that the business object is taken apart and analyzed in detail to be used in to try to make a new business object.

Based on this, Chandra discloses this in paragraph 653 where Chandra discloses the intersection of the transportable application access control definition and the recipient access control definition indicates whether a particular recipient can access an application.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnese Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/5/9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. J./
Examiner, Art Unit 2166

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166